



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

still farther north, assumed what Kluge calls a "verdeutlichendes Element" and became OE. *ġeapman*, etc. Furthermore, that, though starting in South Germany as an *n*-derivative stem designating a noun of agency, it gave birth to many Germanic forms, some of them of primitive type and signification, for example, *kauf*, *ġeap*, meaning 'trade', 'market', 'purchase', 'price', etc.! The theory of the Germanic origin supposes that the word started as a verb meaning first 'strike' and later 'bargain', and as an abstract noun meaning first 'stroke' and later 'bargain', and that when in different parts of the Germanic territory nouns of agency arose, in some it was a weak *n*-stem, in others a compound in *-man*, for example, OE. *ġeapman*, corresponding to *ġeapstōw* 'market place', *ġeapdæg* 'market day,' etc. The *n*-stem arose in the Germanic territory nearest to Italy and so it was this form that crossed the boundary and appeared in Latin. For there is nothing in the way of supposing that this Germanic word came to Rome exactly as at a later date *mango* came over the Alps, as I have shown in *The American Journal of Philology*, vol. 22. It may be objected that a Germanic word might have come to Rome in post-Augustan times, but that we have traces of the use of *caupo* as early as the time of Plautus. This objection, however, ignores the well-known fact that in practically all countries the peddler, the huckster, and, in large cities at least, the inn-keeper, is very likely to be a foreigner,—and we know that this was equally true of Greece and Rome. These people pass from country to country long before armies invade and international relations are thought of.

In dealing with Latin *caupo*, scholars have sometimes associated with it Greek *κάπηλος* 'huckster', 'tavern-keeper.' How they would reconcile the Greek *α* with the Latin *au*, I do not know. There is, however, no need of it, for there is a very simple explanation of *κάπηλος*. It is formed from *κάπη* 'a crib for the food of cattle', 'a manger'. For this explanation it is immaterial whether *κάπη* was thus alluded to in a jocose way, as we sometimes speak of food as 'fodder' and a bed as a 'roost', or whether the *κάπηλος* was originally a man who provided travelers with the bulky food required for their beasts of burden and only incidentally with food for themselves.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

DID BOCCACCIO SUGGEST THE CHARACTER OF CHAUCER'S KNIGHT?

STANZA 40 of Book vi of the *Teseide* reads as follows:

"In cotal guisa co'suoi rugginoso
Dell'arme e del sudor venne in Atene:
E benchè bel non paia, valoroso
Chiunque il vede veramente il tene;
E fe', del modo suo non borioso
Ma umile, parlare a tutti bene:
Ben s'ammiraron della condizione
Chiunque il vide a sí fatto barone."¹

This is the last of six stanzas describing King Evander, who was one of the combatants in the tournament. The details mentioned in this stanza are so similar to the most prominent characteristics of Chaucer's knight, as he is described in the *Prologue* to the *Canterbury Tales* (ll. 43-78), as to suggest that Chaucer may have got the first conception of his knight from this source.

Boccaccio, in the previous five stanzas, has described a Greek warrior-king. He has told Evander's birthplace and parentage, how he was mounted and how he was armed. He has described his dress and that of his followers; and he has devoted especial attention to a description of Evander's shield, on which were depicted scenes illustrating former adventures and experiences.

There is nothing in these stanzas that is exactly the same as in Chaucer's *Prologue*. There are some correspondences but these might easily be accidental,—thus: (a) both are distinguished warriors. (b) Each has followers with him. (c) The previous deeds of valor are told for each, though in different ways—for Evander, it is done by a description of his shield; for the knight, the means is direct narration. But if Chaucer was influenced by this description of Evander, he could not possibly have made use of the details found in these five stanzas,—because the settings are too different. Boccaccio had described a Greek king going to a tournament, while Chaucer wished to present an ideal English knight riding in a company of pilgrims.

But the stanza first quoted seems to bear toward Chaucer a different relation from the other five. There are the following agreements:

¹ 'In this way, with his followers, he came into Athens, begrimed from his arms and from sweat. Although he did not look beautiful, whoever sees him holds him truly valorous. He was not haughty in manner but humble: he spoke well to all. Whoever saw him marveled at this in such a baron.'

Evander came into Athens begrimed from his arms and from sweat.

The knight joined the pilgrims with his clothes stained by his armor.

Evander, though he did not look beautiful, was held to be valorous by all.

The knight was not gay, but he was worthy and wise.

Evander was not proud in manner but humble; he spoke well to all.

The knight was in bearing as meek as a maid; he never said anything discourteous to his inferiors.

It hardly seems to me that these agreements can be explained as due to mere chance. What all found striking in King Evander, we find striking in Chaucer's knight—that such a distinguished warrior should be so humble and courteous in bearing toward those of lesser rank. Chaucer knew the *Teseide*, having early made some sort of translation or paraphrase of it in his lost work, *Palamon and Arcite*. He must, therefore, have been familiar with this description long before he conceived of the *Canterbury Tales*. The *Knight's Tale* is itself the story of the *Teseide*. The character of the knight had to harmonize with the story he was to tell. There is, therefore, a close relationship between the two, and one might suggest the other. If then the *Teseide* has within itself an unneeded character suitable to act as narrator of the story to the Canterbury pilgrims, what is more natural than to suppose that Chaucer might have taken the essential traits of this personage as the nucleus around which to build up his own character of the knight?

FRANK E. BRYANT.

University of Kansas.

CHAUCER AND THE *Roman de Thèbes*.

PROF. LEOPOLD CONSTANS in *Le Roman de Thèbes* (Société des Anciens Textes Français, Paris, 1890), Part ii, p. clix, says:

'Les formes corrompues *Polimites* (*Troilus and Cryscide*, v, 1488) pour *Polinices*, qui se rencontre un peu plus loin, et *Parthonolope*, prouvent que Chaucer connaissait une des redactions en prose de notre poème'.

But Prof. Constans does not mention the argument of the twelve books of Statius' *Thebaid* placed after l. 1498 in all the MSS. of the

Troilus except Harl. 2392 and Rawlinson Poet 163 (Globe Chaucer, p. 552). In the Campsall MS. the first line of this argument reads,

Associat profugum Tideo primus Polimitem,

and the form *Polimitem* or *Polymytem* is found in all the other published MSS. except Gg. 4. 27, which has *Polimite*. There is no similar argument of the *Thebaid* in the *Roman de Thèbes*, and the fact that in the *Troilus* it occurs in Latin is against the theory that Chaucer made use of the French romance.

Prof. Constans supports his view by citing also the form *Parthonolope* for the *Parthonopaeus* of Statius, but here again his assertions are not borne out by the MSS. Campsall, Corpus, and St. John's have *Parthonopea*; Harl. 1239 and Harl. 3943, *Partonopea*; Harl. 2280, *Parthonopes*; and Gg. 4. 27, *Parte-nopea*, in the ninth line of the argument of the *Thebaid*. But since Cb., Cp., Gg. 4. 27, and St. John's give *Parthonope*, Hl. 3943 *Partonope*, Hl. 2280 *Parthonopo*, and Hl. 1239 *Parthenope* as the form of this name in l. 1503 of Chaucer's own text, we may conclude that the *Parthonolope* of the French romance had no influence whatever on the form used by Chaucer.

Prof. Constans continues:

'Une autre preuve nous semble resulter de deux passages où *Theodamas* (évidemment le *Thiodamas* de Stace, puisque, une fois sur deux, il est question du siège de Thèbes), est donné comme un fameux joueur de trompette, à côté de Joab, à qui il attribue le même talent:

At every cours in came loude minstralcie,
That never Joab tromped for to here,
Ne he Theodamas yet half so clere
At Thebes, whan the citee was in doute.

(*The Merchant's Tale*,—E. 1717-21.)

There heard I Joab trumpe also,
Theodamas, and other mo,
And all that used clarion
In Casteloigne and Aragon,
To learnen saw I trumphen there.'

(*The House of Fame*, iii, 155-160.)

The account of the election of Thiodamas as successor to the augur Amphiarus is given in the *Roman de Thèbes* ll. 4951-5172, but there is no mention of Joab; neither is there anything to indicate that Chaucer was following the *Roman* rather than the account in the *Thebaid*, viii, 343.

As a final proof that Chaucer was familiar with a version of the *Roman de Thèbes*, Prof.